



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

40

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/929,381	08/13/2001	Michael A. Kapin	1973	1047

7590 08/18/2005

R&D Counsel (Q-148)
Alcon Universal Ltd.
c/o Alcon Research, Ltd.
6201 South Freeway
Fort Worth, TX 76134-2099

EXAMINER

COOK, REBECCA

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1614

DATE MAILED: 08/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/929,381

Applicant(s)

KAPIN ET AL.

Examiner

Rebecca Cook

Art Unit

1614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 June 2005.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-9 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-9 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

RD

DETAILED ACTION

Claim 4 has been cancelled by the amendment of June 7, 2005. Claims 1-3 and 5-9 are pending and examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 1-3 and 5-9 are again rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. It is still confusing as to whether the "derivative thereof of the formula..." is limited to compounds having the recited formula.

Claim 9 is confusing, since none of the recited disorders are ophthalmic angiogenesis-related disorders.

In view of the amendment to claim 3 the remaining earlier rejection under 35 USC 112, paragraph two is withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102 Withdrawn

In view of the amendment to claim 1 the earlier rejection under 35 USC 102 (e) is withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3 and 5-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over 5,994,379 (Bayly et al) or 6,207,700 (Kalgutkar et al) in view of 6,342,524 (Hellberg et al) and 6,342,524 (Hellberg et al).

Bayly (column 9, lines 17-19) discloses that COX-2 inhibitors are useful to treat diabetic retinopathy. Bayly further discloses the recited routes of administration (column 9, lines 46-50). Bayly does not disclose the instant COX-2 inhibitors.

Kalgutkar (column 1, lines 16-26, column 11, lines 21-39) discloses that the **instant COX-2 inhibitors** are antiangiogenic. Note that Applicants' compounds include the compounds of Kalgutkar when Y is NR^{''}R', and R'' and R' are H.

Additionally, Hellberg (column 5, line 20, column 6, column 8, lines 10-30) discloses that the instant compound is a COX-2 inhibitor and further discloses ophthalmic administration and the instant dosage.

In the absence of a showing of unexpected results commensurate in scope with the claims it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the compounds of Kalgutkar in the method of Bayly to yield the instant method. That is because Kalgutkar discloses that the instant COX-2 inhibitors are antiangiogenic and Bayly discloses that COX-2 inhibitors are useful to treat angiogenic ophthalmic conditions like diabetic retinopathy. Additionally, Hellberg discloses ophthalmic administration and the instant dosage of the instant COX-2 compound.

Applicants' arguments regarding Hellberg are not persuasive, since Hellberg was cited as disclosing the recited compound, that is a COX inhibitor and the instant dosages and dosage amounts.

Art Unit: 1614

Applicants' argument regarding Kalgutkar and the instant compounds is not persuasive, since Kalgutkar discloses the instant amide compounds.

Applicants' argument regarding corneal neovascularization is not persuasive, since it one of the angiogenesis-related disorders recited in claim 7.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-9 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 10-19 of copending Application No. 10/344,881. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the instant method of treating an angiogenesis-related disorder using the compound of claim 1 includes the method of the claims of '881 using 2-amino-3-benzoyl-phenylacetamide.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claims 1-9 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-10 of copending Application No. 10/417,466. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the instant method of treating an angiogenesis-related disorder using the compound of claim 1 includes the method of the claims of '466 using amfenac.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

It is noted that applicants have agreed to file terminal disclaimers to overcome these rejections.

Action Is Final

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 1614

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Cook whose telephone number is (571) 272-0571. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher Low, can be reached on (571) 272-0951.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to Renee Jones (571) 272-0547 in Customer Service.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

The official fax number is 571-273-8300.

Rebecca Cook



Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1614

August 15, 2005